DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 638 EC 140 307

AUTHOR Grayson, Judith H.; And Others
TITLE The Continuing Evolution of Regular and Special Education Collaboration. Resource Report No. 3.
INSTITUTION California Regional Resource Center, Los Angeles.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Media Services and Captioned Films Branch.
PUB DATE Mar 80
CONTRACT 300-77-0476
NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperative Planning; Demonstration Programs; *Disabilities; *Educational Cooperation; *Special Education Teachers; Staff Development; Teacher Attitudes; Teachers
IDENTIFIERS Education for All Handicapped Children Act; *Regular and Special Education Cooperation

ABSTRACT

The paper examines the status and issues involved in collaboration between special education and regular education, a relationship critical to the implementation of P.L. 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. A model for interagency collaboration is applied to the situation, with responsibilities, utilization of resources, and procedures examined in terms of current practice and need. A chart outlines recommended approaches to collaboration through personnel development, demonstrations and model sites, technical assistance networks, new legislation, and an attitude change campaign. (CL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED208638

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EC

# Resource Report No. 3

# THE CONTINUING EVOLUTION OF REGULAR AND SPECIAL EDUCATION COLLABORATION

BY JUDITH M. GRAYSON, Ph.D.
DIANE ARNOLD
SUSAN HOCEVAR
LYN STARR
CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTER

EC 140 307

**March 1980**

# THE CONTINUING EVOLUTION OF REGULAR AND SPECIAL EDUCATION COLLABORATION

An analysis of the State-of-Art of
Service Delivery and
Technical Assistance Activities
Provided to SEAs and LEAs
Under P.L. 94-142

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTER**
University of Southern California
600 So. Commonwealth
Los Angeles, California 90005

LEARNING RESOURCE BRANCH
DIVISION OF MEDIA SERVICES, BUREAU OF EDUCATION
FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Regional Resource Centers are federally-funded projects under the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred. Initial printing of this document was funded through contract number 300-77-0476, Mid-South Regional Resource Center, University of Kentucky.

# *Table of Contents*


| | *Page* |
|---|---|
| Foreword | V |
| Preface | VII |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Background | 2 |
| Legislation | 2 |
| Current Practice | 3 |
| Needs Assessment | 5 |
| Recommendations and Resources | 8 |
| Recommendations | 8 |
| Resources | 9 |
| Summary | 11 |
| Bibliography | 12 |

# *Foreword*

With the significant expansion of educational programs for the handicapped as a result of recent legislation, most notably Public Law 94-142: The Education for All Handicapped Act of 1975, it is imperative that states be provided with the necessary support systems to implement such programs as the law requires. Often, what is needed most is information: that is, best practices, work on the development of models and systems, and current definitions to implement legislation. This type of information is often categorized as technical assistance, but it is information, nonetheless.

In 1970 the authors of Public Law 91-230 (Education of the Handicapped Act), Part C, anticipated the need for information by providing for a national program of Regional Resource Centers (RRCs) "which will develop and apply the best methods of appraising the special educational needs of handicapped children referred to them and will provide other services to assist in meeting such needs." Currently, RRCs provide technical assistance to state education agencies (SEAs) and through them to local school districts and handicapped children. There have been a number of work-scope definitions and regional configurations for RRCs during the past eight years. During this period, the RRCs have demonstrated flexible and successful means of providing states with technical assistance.

As the sharing of information continues within the RRC system, it is apparent that general national concerns emerge. What happens, however, is that a multiplicity of uncoordinated efforts are expended toward finding a solution, when the answer might best be sought through a coordinated effort. To this end, a series of Resource Reports has been established by the RRCs.

By virtue of their close association with all of the states, RRCs are in an advantageous position to feel the national pulse with regard to the critical life signs in special education; the RRCs have access to needed information. When an issue is identified as a significant national concern, usually by common consensus of the RRCs (though there may be no formal pronouncement of the fact), an RRC will undertake to research the issue and present the results of this effort for review. In this way, a center or a consortium of centers may tackle a particular issue with the confidence that the issue is either unique to the region(s) or that it is of significant national concern. Through a carefully designed process of review and editing, Resource Reports are created by the RRC system to formally address these critical issues in a timely fashion.

It is hoped that as more and more of these issues are addressed, there will be time for a look at additional emerging issues. Thus, the Resource Reports may serve as a means of addressing the issues before they become critical. The Resource Reports then serve both a short-range purpose and a long-range function. In either case, they are to provide the basic information needed in the development of educational programs for the handicapped.

James A. Tucker,
Editor

# *Preface*

When asked to list important issues needing immediate and in-depth consideration to enable the full implemenation of Public Law 94-142, the California Regional Resource Center staff had no trouble generating a lengthy list. In our work with the State Education Agency and Local Education Agencies as product developers, trainers, and providers of technical assistance, we have watched California educators become increasingly capable and competent in meeting the educational needs of handicapped children and youth. We have also observed, however, the needs of the implementors becoming more diverse and complex as educators reach for quality during times of fiscal restraint, increasing leglislative requirements, and expanding community involvement. The work of fully implementing the letter and intent of Public Law 94-142 is only partially done.

When asked to review our list of issues and focus on the most important one, again we had little difficulty. Since the concept of least restrictive environment is so critical a feature of PL 94-142, it was clear to us that effective collaboration between regular and special education is at the root of successful implementation of this law. Regular educators are the key to the successful implementation of the least restrictive environment since they are in a position to impact the values, attitudes, skills, and other behaviors of the students, parents, and the community.

The position of the California Regional Resource Center is that through meaningful collaboration and cooperation, special and regular educators and support personnel together can better assist handicapped students to develop abilities for living productive, independent, satisfying lives, and thereby model for regular education students a belief in the dignity and worth of all people.

The authors of this paper wish to thank their colleagues at the California Regional Resource Center:

Joan Honeycutt, Ed.D., Educational Specialist—for clarifying, expanding, and summarizing the issue addressed in our paper;

Anne Langstaff Pasanella, Ph.D., Educational Specialist—for assistance in reviewing, editing, and technical writing;

Constance Russell, M.A., Editor—for support, creative thinking, and skillful editing;

and

James Tucker, Ph.D., RRC Consultant—for support, ideas, and constructive feedback

Robert H. Audette, Ph.D., Field Reviewer; Edward E. Gickling, Ph.D., Field Reviewer; Rita Reynolds, Field Reviewer—for constructive feedback and recommendations.

We also acknowledge our capable and dedicated support staff, all of whom played an essential part in the production of this document:

Dan Carter
Nancy Daulton
Cora Christion Holliday
Nikki Klauschie
Jane H. McIver

# *Introduction*

The purpose of this paper is to examine current practice, present needs, and potential ways to meet identified needs in the areas of regular and special education collaboration. Historically, the recognition of the need for collaboration, or cooperation and interface, across these two facets of the educational system dates back to the 1960's. The response to the passage of Public Law 94-142 in 1975 resulted in recognition and support of the urgent need for intra-agency collaboration. This legislation clearly establishes the right for all students to participate, to the extent appropriate, in an educational environment free of unnecessary restriction. The historical boundary characterizing an educationally separatist posture, with special and regular education operating as more or less autonomous systems, can no longer be maintained. Separation of the special education delivery system and students with exceptional needs from the educational mainstream can no longer be justified. Autonomy must yield to a single delivery system characterized by collaboration in which educators with new or expanded role responsibilities demonstrate renewed commitment to providing a free, appropriate, public education for all America's children and youth. A continuum of program options must be available to ensure an appropriate education to all students regardless of the severity of the disability. Provision of appropriate placement compels educators to develop creative collaborative education plans.

Few, if any, conceptual models presently exist in education to provide a paradigm for collaborative interaction between branches of the educational system. Therefore, Audette's (1979) *inter*agency agreement model, which identifies three classes of collaboration (Responsibilities; Utilization of Resources; Procedures), was adapted to provide a structure for the issues discussed in this paper. Education is one agency, and therefore this paper uses the term "intra-agency" to describe the relationships among the components of that delivery system.

The position taken in this paper is that cooperation between regular and special educator, or *intra*-agency collaboration, is critical to the effective implementation of the least restructive environment mandate of Public Law 94-142. It is further argued that such collaboration requires educators to develop new skills, and to refine, or if necessary, abandon traditional educational practices, so that we may reach the single system-wide goal of providing quality educational programs to meet the needs of all students. To organize key information and ideas for the reader, the remainder of this paper is divided into two parts:

*Background*. Included here is an historical sketch of the interface between regular and special education and a description of significant aspects of current practice. In addition, critical need is identified via the review and study of current practice.

*Recommendations and Resources*. A list of possible solutions is presented. Each solution could be used for any of the three classes of identified needs. Resources for implementing proposed solutions are also presented.

The discussion which follows explores the evolution of collaborative efforts and the need for change in education.

# *Background*

## Legislation

The key motivating force for examining the interface between regular education and special education is the least restrictive environment concept as mandated by Public Law (PL) 94-142, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act, and Section 504 of PL 94-112 (45 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 84.34). Federal regulations stipulate that:

> . . . each public agency shall insure: (1) that to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not handicapped. . . (45 CFR Section 121a. 550(b).

The intent of the least restrictive environment mandate is to minimize the extent to which students with handicaps are segregated from their nonhandicapped peers.

To operationalize the least restrictive environment concept, a continuum of program options must be available. The term mainstreaming is commonly used to refer to the implementation of the least restrictive environment concept. It implies the full use of the range of delivery options available through regular and special education programs, not the wholesale placement of exceptional students into regular programs. The federal regulations define the continuum of program options and state that placement decisions are to be based on the educational needs of the individual students rather than on the type of handicapping condition or the available service options:

(a) Each public agency shall insure that a continuum of alternative placements is available to meet the needs of handicapped children for special education and related services.

(b) The continuum required under paragraph (a) of this section must:

  (1) Include the alternative placements listed in the definition of special education under Section 121a.13 of Subpart A (instruction in regular classes, special classes, special schools, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions), and

  (2) Make provision for supplementary services (such as resource room or itinerant instruction) to be provided in conjunction with regular class placement (45 CFR Section 121a.551).

The right of a handicapped student to be educated in the least restrictive environment implies that all of the resources available in the educational system be examined together to determine the most appropriate program. Specialized programs should be used to meet student needs which cannot be met within the regular program. This type of planning requires communication and coordination between regular and special educators within the educational delivery system.

## Historic Context

The legislative mandate for the provision of a least restrictive environment calls for a change in the historical relationship between regular and special education, described by Reynolds (1977), as the "two-box" model. According to Reynolds, the predominant organizational structure in education which existed well into the 1960's and early 70's could be characterized by two kinds of classrooms (regular and special), two broad classifications of children (regular education students and special education students), and teachers trained for one of two roles (as a regular education teacher or a special education teacher). This "two-box" model clearly demonstrates that there has been little interface between regular and special education. Instead, two autonomous systems have existed; each with its own students, staff, facilities, resources and curriculum.

The efficacy of the "two-box" model was challenged long before the 1975 enactment of PL 94-142 (Johnson, 1962; Dunn, 1968). Professional educators, parents, and the courts began to argue that many special class students could be better served through the less restrictive environment of the regular classroom, or by combining regular education placement with needed support and instructional services from special education personnel.

Prior to the passage of PL 94-142, a few school districts began to pilot a placement process based on the concept of least restrictive environment (e.g., California Master Plan for Special Education authorized by Assembly Bill 4040, 1974). In 1975, least restrictive educational placement of handicapped students and the provision of a continuum of placement options became a national mandate (PL 94-142). If the schools of America are to comply with the letter and spirit of this mandate, regular and special education cannot continue to function as two autonomous, often competitive, systems with separate responsibilities, resources and procedures. Instead, regular and special educators will have to work cooperatively, indeed become partners in meeting the educational needs of handicapped students.

The major role changes for all school personnel are an inevitable result of recent legislation on the education of handicapped students is well documented in the literature (Gickling, Murphy & Mallory, 1979;

Meyen & Moran, 1979; Nevin, 1976; Reynolds & Birch, 1977). For example, regular classroom teachers will have special education students returning to or continuing to participate in their classrooms. These teachers will be asked to work cooperatively with special education personnel who may also be functioning in a new role as resource or consultant teachers, instead of having only the responsibility of self-contained special classrooms. In addition, the PL 94-142 requirement of parental involvement in educational planning for their children creates new or expanded responsibilities for all educators (Reynolds & Birch, 1977).

It is significant that the pressures to merge the "two-boxes" (regular and special education) into a system capable of meeting the needs of all students came primarily through educational policy interventions and not from within the school system itself. As Sarason and Doris (1979) point out, ". . . that fact alone allows one to predict that these pressures would be resisted" (p. 361). Though change in educational policy with regard to placement of handicapped students has occurred quickly, the change in educational practice occurs slowly. Problems associated with attempting to rapidly and effectively implement such a major policy change have been repeatedly described in the literature (Hewett, Artuso & Taylor, 1979). These problems include a general lack of organizational readiness, lack of personnel preparation for their changing responsibilities, negative attitudes of teachers and administrators, and an equivocal mechanism for the utilization of resources (Gickling, Murphy & Mallory, 1979). An additional problem is the lack of clear research evidence that the least restrictive environment really works to the best interests of students. Several authors (Keogh & Levitt, 1976; MacMillan & Semmel, 1977) have addressed the difficulties inherent in evaluating the outcomes of the application of this concept. It appears that the 1975 statement of Gickling and Theobald still holds: ". . . the philosophical commitment to mainstreaming (least restrictive environment) seems to have outraced its research support" (p. 312). Without such research evidence, educators are hampered in their attempts to promote the concept of the least restrictive environment.

## Current Practice

A useful model for examining current practice with regard to the least restrictive environment mandate and the implicit call for collaboration between regular and special education is that proposed by Audette (1979) as a framework for interagency collaboration. In Audette's model, there are three sequential classes of collaboration: Responsibilities, Utilization of Resources, and Procedures. The first class, *Responsibilities*, centers on agreements regarding the adoption of a common understanding as to who provides what services to students with exceptional needs and their families. The second class, *Utilization of Resources*, includes agreements concerning the management of shared personnel, facilities, equipment, and funds. The third class, *Procedures*, concerns provisions for coordinating such activities as outreach, assessment, planning and reporting.

The application of an interagency model to an intra-agency situation is justifiable given the current administrative autonomy of the various categories of programs within education (Title I, Bilingual Education, PL 94-142, etc.). The following review of selected current practices is discussed in terms of Audette's three classes of collaboration.

(1) *Responsibilities*. As cited above, regular and special educators are experiencing major changes in their job responsibilities. These changes have major implications for the current practices in preservice and inservice programs for all educators. For the most part, preservice programs still adhere to the "two-box" model: college students seeking a special education credential enroll in a department separate from those working on a regular teaching credential. Each program includes its own unique curricula, goals, and objectives. Sarason and Doris (1979) comment:

> One of the clearest implications of Public Law 94-142 is that the gulf between special and regular education has to be bridged, and yet the law requires no change in our college and university training centers. (p. 391)

A related problem exists in the current practice of credentialing teachers. Few states require regular educators to take courses in special education in order to qualify for a teaching certificate (Higgins & Morresi, 1979). Even in these cases the requirements are minimal and only a beginning.

The Dean's Grant Programs, funded by Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, represent an effort to demonstrate models of preservice training programs adapted in order that teachers-in-training may learn about working with a range of student abilities and disabilities. This program is a joint venture between various educational components within institutions of higher education, including regular and special education.

> The Dean's Grant Program is intended to give deans of schools or colleges of education an opportunity to reconceptualize the preparation curricula so that the needs of handicapped children may become an integral part of all teacher training. (*Teacher Education Special Education*, 1978)

Recognizing the need for *inservice* preparation of personnel to facilitate the implementation of a free, appropriate, public education for handicapped students, PL 94-142 does call for the development of comprehensive systems of personnel development for both

special and regular educators (45 CFR 121a.380 *et. seq.*). A parallel effort toward improving staff development activities is also occurring within regular education with the federal initiation of the Mondale Teacher Centers and similar state-initiated programs such as California's teacher centers funded by Assembly Bill 551. Unfortunately, there is no requirement that inservice efforts in regular and special education be coordinated and complementary. Staff development activities for special educators are designed and implemented separately from those for regular educators. Hutson (1979) of the National Inservice Network states that, "It is difficult to get local education agency support for inservice education to train regular classroom teachers in educating handicapped children" (p.4).

California has initiated what may be an exemplary inservice model, which demonstrates the philosophy that inservice is the shared responsibility of regular and special education. This has been accomplished by housing representatives of the Office of Special Education's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) in regular education teacher centers around the state. In this way, there can be better coordination on the local level in the delivery of inservice programs. The California Regional Resource Center has assisted in this effort by identifying inservice needs and by developing information and skills development workshops for use by the CSPD.

The National Inservice Network has identified another current practice which is problematic to staff development activities—that "inservice of all kinds is often built on the premise that teachers are somehow deficient—lacking in some skill" (Hutson, 1979, p. 4). This premise creates great attitudinal barriers to inservice programs. Contributing to this barrier is the fact that inservice training is too often based on what the administrator feels the teacher should know rather than on staff input into the decision-making process (Hutson, 1979).

(2) *Utilization of Resources*. The need to more closely examine the use of existing resources to serve handicapped students and their families has been demonstrated by the current federal emphasis on developing *interagency* agreements (Higgins & Barresi, 1979). A similar need exists within the educational system itself. According to a report from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), Inspector General's Office, "Separate administrative systems for delivering services under Title I and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act 'sometimes creates barriers to effective service delivery' and are costly" (*Education of the Handicapped*, 1979, p. 9). The problem, however, is not restricted to Title I programs and special education programs. The same report from the Inspector General's Office describes the results of a survey conducted in six states which revealed that school administrators see programs such as PL 94-142, Title I, bilingual education and vocational education as similar specialized programs for "overlapping target groups" of children. Variation among districts in the types of services provided by these programs is also reported (*Service Delivery Assessment, Education for the Handicapped*, HEW Inspector General, 1979).

As Meyen and Moran (1979) point out, distinctions between many of these federally supported programs have been maintained primarily for purposes of funding, program monitoring, and accountability. The administrative autonomy of these programs, however, should not be allowed to interfere with the availability of a broad continuum of services for providing adequate and appropriate individualized programs. For example, a student eligible for bilingual or Title I programs may be considered ineligible for other special programs, thus receiving a partially appropriate but inadequate program (Meyen & Moran, 1979). According to Reynolds and Birch (1977), the distinction between Title I, remedial education, drug education, bilingual education, special education, and other categorical programs, each with its separate administrative officers and state or federal regulations "ought to be blurred, if not eliminated, in favor of programs that serve the special needs of individual children" (p. 682).

A current trend toward the utilization of resources across programs is demonstrated by the mandate that at least 10% of vocational education program funds be specifically applied to vocational education programs for the handicapped (45 CFR 104.312). However, in order to more fully meet the total educational needs of students with various "specialized" educational needs and to do so through the efficient use of fiscal, personnel and facility resources, efforts toward intra-agency collaboration must be greatly increased.

(3) *Procedures*. Within the Audette (1979) model for *interagency* agreements, the third major type of agreement deals with collaboration on procedures. The specific types of procedures defined by Audette include outreach and screening; referral; assessment; Individualized Program (IP) development; placement and review; case management; annual planning; budgeting; and reporting. The report from HEW's Inspector General's Office describes current practice as being dominated by separate administrative procedures for the various categorical programs within education (*Education of the Handicapped*, 1979). These separate administrative procedures are strikingly illustrated in excessive record keeping, duplicative assessments, and delay in provision of service to the child. Bilingual education programs, Title I programs, PL 94-142, and other such separately funded programs each have their own, yet strikingly similar, procedural guidelines for outreach; screening referral; assessment; placement; program planning; implementation and review; re-

porting; monitoring; etc. For the teacher or administrator dealing with more than one program, the burden seems excessive and unnecessary, given the fact that many of these procedures could be streamlined and consolidated.

Given Audette's (1979) model for the types of interagency agreement, the current state of affairs on intraagency collaboration on program procedures is not surprising. According to Audette, agreement as to the distribution and use of resources (fiscal, personnel, equipment, facilities, etc.) must be established before agreement on complementary procedures can be accomplished. This process can be illustrated by examining the relationship between special education and vocational education. As described in the previous section, as a result of the Education Amendments of 1976 (PL 94-482), special education and vocational education are now combining fiscal resources in order to provide vocational education programs for handicapped students. These combined resources have facilitated local procedural collaboration between the two programs. The inclusion of a vocational education or career education component in the Individualized Education Program (IEP) illustrates procedural collaboration. In some model school districts, personnel from both programs are participating cooperatively in the IEP process. It is important to note that this illustration of two educational components working together to meet student needs is just a beginning. The predominant current practice continues to be the use of autonomous rather than collaborative, procedures.

As viewed from the perspective of Audette's (1979) three classes or levels of agreement, current educational practice does not yet reflect the degree of cooperation between regular and special education which is essential to appropriate application of the concept of least restrictive environment. The preceding three-part discussion of current practice reveals several need areas which will be elaborated upon.

| AUDETTE'S CLASSES OF INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION | CURRENT PRACTICE |
|---|---|
| Responsibilities | • minimal recognition that reg. and spec. ed. must be trained to assume new roles.<br>• special ed. credential program segregated from regular program<br>• minimal inservice training options to assist educators in assuming their new roles<br>• inservice based on admin. requests rather than teachers' |
| | • Comprehensive Systems of Personnel Development (CSPDs) beginning to develop |
| Utilization of | • admin. autonomy of reg. and spec. ed. programs |
| Resources | • separate personnel, facilities, budgets often competing for resources |
| Procedures | • separate screening, referral, assessment, IP, review, case management and reporting systems among reg. and spec. ed. programs often causing duplication of effort. |

## Needs Assessment

The least restrictive environment stipulation of PL 94-142 has established a general need for regular and special educators to increase the coordination of their responsibilities, resources and procedures. Specific needs, documented by various needs assessments, national surveys, questionnaires, and critical incidence techniques, are discussed below with reference to the three classes described by Audette.

(1) *Responsibilities*. The legislated changes in the way handicapped children are to be educated are affecting the roles of teachers and administrators in both special and regular education (Gickling, Murphy & Mallory, 1979; Meyen & Moran, 1979; Nevin, 1979; Reynolds & Birch, 1977). These previously cited changing roles and responsibilities of regular and special educators create a need for adjustments in existing *preservice* teacher training programs and in the inservice programs designed for teachers and administrators already in the field (Harvey, 1976; Saettler, 1976).

Reynolds and Birch (1977) examined needs assessment data based upon the inservice needs of regular education teachers and concluded that preservice preparation for the education of exceptional students is inadequate. Few states require regular education teachers to complete course work in special education in order to qualify for teaching certification (Higgins & Barresi, 1979). As regular classroom teachers take on increased responsibility for the education of students with handicaps, regular teacher preparation programs need to include training content and practice previously reserved for special education teachers (Yarger, Howey, & Joyce, 1977).

This shift in responsibility also changes the preservice training needs of the special education teacher. The concept of shared responsibility often requires the special education teacher to expand and or alter his or her role to that of providing instructional support or non-teaching support, e.g. communication skills, group process techniques. Consultation skills are criti-

cal to the effective performance of these supportive roles, ". . . special education personnel programs generally have not been providing their trainees who are serving supportive roles with a strong base for a significant part of their functioning, particularly in terms of change agent skills" (Little, 1979, p. 354).

The implementation of the least restrictive environment requires changes in preservice training for regular and special education teachers. It is apparent there is a critical need for cooperative curriculum planning between regular and special education departments in colleges and universities.

In the *California Master Plan for Special Education, Evaluation Report* (1977-78), regular educators stated that despite efforts to provide inservice, they still feel unprepared to teach exceptional children. This report identified a need to conduct a special study to clarify the inservice needs of regular education teachers. One critical aspect of such a study would be the examination of the types of inservice available and the usefulness of the content as perceived by the regular education teacher. Regular and special education teachers alike have stated a need to be included in determining the content of inservice sessions (Gickling, Murphy & Mallory, 1979).

Hutson (1979) observed that there is a need to convince administrators that inservice must be based on "needs of the trainees rather than on what administrators think teachers should want to know" (p. 4).

The effectiveness of the inservice delivery methods needs to be assessed. Alternatives to the typical staff development programs, such as conducting inservice in classrooms based on the specific needs expressed by the classroom teacher, are necessary.

Regular and special education teachers need new skills to ensure that they are effective participants in the IEP process. The need for a clarification and a definition of the scope of their roles in the IEP process was indicated by both regular and special education teachers (Gickling, Murphy & Mallory, 1979).

Implementing PL 94-142 requires changes in all levels of public education. Regular education administrators have identified a need for competencies in advocacy and leadership functions as well as knowledge related to technical aspects of providing a student with an individualized education program (Nevin, 1979). A need to acquire knowledge of current research, trends and programs for effectively educating exceptional students was also expressed.

(2) *Utilization of Resources.* Regular education

| AUDETTE'S CLASSES OF INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION | CURRENT PRACTICE | NEED |
|---|---|---|
| Responsibilities | • minimal recognition that reg. and spec. ed. must be trained to assume new roles<br>• special ed. credential program segregated from regular program<br>• minimal inservice training options to assist educators in assuming their new roles<br>• inservice based on admin. requests rather than teachers'<br>• CSPDs beginning to develop | • training for new roles<br>• reg. ed. credential programs that include special ed. content and practice<br>• spec. ed. credential programs that include consultation skills<br>• cooperative planning between reg. and spec. ed. departments<br>• study to clarify inservice needs for new roles<br>• teachers to be included in determining content of inservice<br>• inservice for regular teachers to develop skills for working with spec. ed. students and programs<br>• inservice for spec. ed. personnel and admin. to develop skills for increasing collaboration. |
| Utilization of Resources | • admin. autonomy of reg. and spec. ed. programs<br>• separate personnel, facilities and budgets | • awareness of service, facilities and funds available<br>• time for cooperative planning<br>• development of a "common educational philosophy" or "school plan" at school site level |
| Procedures | • separate screening, referral, assessment, IP, review, case management & reporting systems among reg. & spec. ed. programs | • consolidation & coordination of multiple procedures for outreach, screening, referral, assessment, IP, review, case management & reporting systems. |

teachers have expressed a need to acquire knowledge on how to use available special education services more advantageously.

Both regular and special education personnel have also expressed a need for efficient, practical and regular scheduling of planning meetings. A need was also stated for time allocation to ensure cooperative planning (*California Master Plan for Special Education, Evaluation Report*, 1977-78).

The need for coordination of the separate administrative systems which exist at the school site (e.g., Title I, PL 94-142, and Bilingual Education) was mentioned in a report from HEW's Inspector General's Office. According to the same report, lack of this coordination "sometimes creates barriers to effective service delivery" as well as being costly. Administrators have expressed a need to develop among their entire school staff a "common educational philosophy" toward integrating students with exceptional needs. A need to acquire skills to encourage special education personnel to participate in all school activities was also identified by administrators (*California Master Plan for Special Education, Evaluation Report*, 1977-78).

(3) *Procedures*. Each of the various categorical programs within education have their own procedural guidelines for each aspect of their delivery service. The multiple procedures constrain teachers and administrators, thus delaying services to students. A need to consolidate and coordinate these multiple procedures is evident.

# *Recommendations and Resources*

## Recommendations

The design and selection of solutions for bridging the existing gaps between regular and special education will vary according to the type of cooperation and coordination the programs are ready to develop. For instance, as Audette (1977) mentions, cooperative efforts dealing with program responsibilities and utilization of resources for mutually agreed upon goals need to be developed prior to the design of processes for combining and coordinating program procedures. The solution is also dependent on the requirements of relevant legislation and regulations, the competencies and attitudes of the personnel involved, and the resources available. Systems or methods which are promising alternatives for State Education Agencies (SEAs) and Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to consider are discussed below and are organized under areas of: personnel development; demonstrations and model sites; products; technical assistance; legislation; research; and public awareness campaigns.

## Personnel Development

With the new responsibilities and roles required for full special education/regular education collaboration has come the need for personnel to refine their existing skills and to develop a repertoire of new competencies. Personnel—special and regular teachers, support staff, and administrators—should receive the foundation for these new skills in their *preservice training*, an extension and refinement of those skills in *inservice training* and in ongoing *consultation*. Choices made with regard to process and content of preservice, inservice, and consultation programs affect personnel behavior and thus, student behavior. Suggested alternatives to the current process and content used in staff development of regular and special educators will be discussed in the following section. Process and content variables are presented below.

*Process*. Procedures for personnel development include:

1) Field-based preservice training with exposure to many types of programs and learners.
2) Internships for regular teachers to work with resource specialists/special education consultants and for special educators to work with regular education resource personnel.
3) Inservice based on teachers' and administrators' requests and input.
4) Follow-up or consultation conducted in a frequent, personalized, supportive manner.

*Content*. Collaboration of regular and special education across the areas of responsibilities, resources and procedures requires:

1) New knowledge or information sharing regarding:
   - Legislation affecting special education *and* regular education.
   - Current theory and practice in special education *and* regular education, with an emphasis on special education being a natural, yet remedial, outgrowth of the goals and content taught in the regular classroom.
   - Resources available through both regular and special education, as well as other agencies (services, materials, funding, facilities, incentive grants).
2) Skill development in

Teaming:
- Communicating frequently and openly with professionals and parents who may have differing beliefs, value systems, knowledge and skills.
- Using group techniques to solve problems and make decisions
- Sharing the responsibility for making each team member feel included and respected.
- Sharing the responsibility for the team actually accomplishing the goals.

Planning:
- Designing and using needs assessment methods that will tap immediate and emerging needs.
- Establishing long range goals
- Defining objectives and/or activities
- Task analyzing the objectives and activities
- Selecting appropriate personnel
- Determining time requirements and schedules
- Developing policies and guidelines

Teaching:
- Using prescriptive teaching, classroom management techniques, and other skills required in the dynamic process of using constant feedback and program modification to meet the needs of each student

Leading and Coordinating:
- Coordinating the activities of an interdisciplinary team
- Coordinating the activities of regular and special education professionals, aides, volunteers and students
- Modeling time management practices

| AUDETTE'S CLASSES OF INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION | CURRENT PRACTICE | NEED | SOLUTIONS<br>To be selected on basis of level of devel<br>PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT | DEMONSTRATIONS, MODEL SITES | PRODUCTS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Responsibilities | • minimal recognition that reg. and spec. ed. must be trained to assume new roles<br>• special ed. credential program segregated from regular program<br>• minimal inservice training options to assist educators in assuming their new roles<br>• inservice based on admin. requests rather than teachers'<br>• CSPDs beginning to develop | • training for new roles<br>• reg. ed. credential programs that include special ed. content and practice<br>• spec. ed. credential programs that include consultation skills<br>• cooperative planning between reg. and spec. ed. departments<br>• study to clarify inservice needs for new roles<br>• teachers to be included in determining content of inservice<br>• inservice for regular teachers to develop skills for working with spec. ed. students and programs<br>• inservice for spec. ed. personnel and admin. to dev. skills for increasing collaboration | • spec. ed. content in reg. ed. credential programs<br>• focus on training for new roles<br>• field based preservice<br>• internships for reg. teachers in spec. ed.<br>• inservice based on teachers' and admin. input<br>• frequent, personalized follow-up<br>• content to include:<br>  • information sharing re laws & resources in reg. & spec. ed.<br>  • skill development in teaming, planning, teaching leading, consulting, advocating | • schools with personnel successfully assuming new roles, open for visitation<br>• conference demonstrations displaying ways in which schools dev. school plans | • matrices of laws & services to pinpoint responsibilities<br>• promising practices documents describing model programs<br>• review of literature, articles, & other |
| Utilization of Resources | • admin. autonomy of reg. and spec. ed. programs<br>• separate personnel, facilities and budgets | • awareness of services, facilities, and funds available<br>• time for cooperative planning<br>• development of a "common educational philosophy" or "school plan" at school site level | • content to include:<br>  • knowledge re laws and resources<br>  • skill development in designing systems for combining personnel, facilities & budgets | • schools with reg. & spec. ed. sharing equipment, facilities, personnel & funds<br>• demonstrations displaying ways in which schools dev. sharing of equip., personnel, etc. | • matrices of laws and services to pinpoint resources available<br>• guidelines for systems to combine personnel, facilities, budgets<br>• directories of resources<br>• promising practices document decribing model programs<br>• review of literature, articles, & other |
| Procedures | • separate screening referral, assessment, IP, review, case management & reporting systems among reg. & spec. ed. programs | • consolidation & coordination of multiple procedures for outreach, screening, referral, assessment, IP, review, case management & reporting systems | • content to include:<br>  • awareness of laws and procedures<br>  • skill development in designing joint forms and procedures | • schools using combined forms and procedures for screening referral, instruction, evaluating<br>• demonstrations displaying ways in which schools dev. cooperative procedures | • matrices of laws & services to pinpoint procedural requirements and constraints<br>• guidelines for ways of combining procedures<br>• promising practices documents describing model programs<br>• review of literature, articles & other information |

ONS

levelopment of collaboration

| TA NETWORK | NEW LEGISLATION | ATTITUDE CHANGE CAMPAIGN |
|---|---|---|
| • personalized assistance in helping SEA or LEA in identifying & working through problems which relate to personnel assuming new roles for PL 94-142 | • to clarify responsibilities<br>• to expand the target population served (i.e., the mandatory programs for handicapped infants) | • awareness program re PL94-142 and the new roles it brings; presented via AV TV, printed materials, and other presentation; for different university disciplines, SEA depts. LEA programs and the community |
| • personalized assistance to LEA or SEA in solving problems evolving from efforts to collaborate on the use of personnel, facilities, funds | • to enable sharing personnel, facilities and funds | • awareness programs regarding the many possible ways of sharing resources and the benefits accrued |
| • personalized assistance to LEA or SEA in solving problems regarding the combining of procedures across programs | • to facilitate use of common forms, procedures, and timelines | • awareness programs regarding the possibilities for and advantages of coordinating procedures |

- Negotiating or mediating in conflict situations
- Employing effective public relations techniques to foster collaboration
- Monitoring procedural safeguards
- Managing multiple-funding budgets

Planning and Conducting Inservice:

- Using an effective needs assessment
- Developing content to meet needs
- Employing successful training techniques
- Implementing follow-up activities
- Evaluating

Consulting:

- Keeping informed about current issues, theory, practice, materials
- Modeling effective communication techniques with professionals and parents
- Selecting appropriate group processing techniques
- Selecting appropriate problem-solving and decision-making systems.

Advocating:

- Practicing public relations techniques and assertiveness in assuring awareness of the handicapped, their needs and rights along with the rights of all children.

## Demonstrations and Model Sites

Another solution to current delivery problems is to provide the fiscal and personnel resources necessary to develop models of effective collaboration between regular and special education. Model sites can provide documentation of the procedures utilized in establishing and maintaining a coordinated program. In addition, model sites can provide educational personnel with the opportunity to observe key features of a joint program in order to replicate or adapt components of the model at other local sites.

## Products

Products can become catalysts for new ideas and day-to-day resources for planning and implementing successful regular and special education interaction. Especially useful would be guidelines of steps to use in inter intra-agency planning, directories of service providers, matrices of laws and services, descriptions of promising practices, reviews of research literature, and concept papers.

## A Network Which Provides Technical Assistance

Consultant services may be provided for SEAs and LEAs needing initial or advanced help unique to their own situation or concerns. Such consultants must be skilled in planning, problem solving, generating ideas, evaluating, negotiating, reporting, demonstrating, and instructing. Technical assistance at its best would extend to the local level, would provide follow-up service and would continually move the clients toward becoming their own problem solvers.

## New Legislation

Legislation is required to overcome some of the barriers to intra-agency collaboration. For example, legislation is necessary to put categorical programs (i.e., Compensatory Education, Vocational Education, Special Education) on synchronized timelines (i.e., with regard to state plan timelines, individual program review schedules), in agreement regarding age levels of service and in agreement regarding requirements for Individual Program forms (IPs) and procedural safeguards.

## Research

Well-designed research studies should assist in identifying other viable solutions, in improving or testing current practices, and in more precisely defining current needs. Topics might include:

- An impact study of the effect of PL 94-142 upon students' achievement. Through such a study educators could identify those areas of the law which have received "over-implementation" (i.e., IEPs that are ten pages long) and those areas in which adequate support systems are not in evidence.
- Research to determine the efficacy of the Least Restrictive Environment concept. The field needs hard data on this issue.
- Study of the most cost-effective and programmatically effective means for providing technical assistance. Is assistance more beneficial at the LEA or the SEA level?

## Public Awareness Campaigns

Cross-disciplinary programs can be designed to increase community awareness regarding the need of all students for quality education and to strengthen the community's commitment to meet those needs. Such programs could be followed by more in-depth activities aimed at producing positive changes in values and attitudes toward the handicapped.

## Resources

Some of the resources needed to implement the above solutions are already available. Only their focus or content would need to change or be expanded to provide assistance in interagency collaboration:

1) Professional organizations (i.e., Council for Exceptional Children, National Association of State Directors of Special Education)—conferences, products, legislative committees.
2) SEAs—comprehensive system of personnel de-

velopment, research, technical assistance, and program development in special and regular education.

3) Universities—preservice, graduate programs, continuing education, Dean's Grants, research.
4) Federally funded projects—Regional labs, National Inservice Network, research grants, incentive grants, Title VI-D projects, teacher centers, Regional Resource Centers (RRCs).

New resources are also needed. Yet to be developed is a regional network, similar to the Regional Resource Center network, with:

1) A workscope to include assisting in collaboration between special and regular education.
2) Support from both special and regular education funds.
3) A national, state, and local perspective of needs and resources.
4) Affiliation with a university system.
5) Sufficient resources to permit cost-effective exploration of new solution ideas.
6) Staff possessing change-agent, technical assistance, product development and research skills.
7) Staff experienced in regular and special education collaborative efforts, such as:
   - Regular education training modules
     California RRC 1979
     Washington, DC RRC 1979
   - Regular and special education administrators' training
     California RRC 1980
   - Conferences regarding special and regular education collaboration or least restrictive environment
     Northeast RRC 1979
     Midwest RRC 1979

It is anticipated that utilization of both existing and proposed resources as listed above would greatly facilitate development and implementation of previously identified solutions. Even with projects and personnel specifically assigned to the task of helping regular and special educators find ways and means to work together, common goals cannot be reached without regional agencies to lead and nurture the process in its initial phase and to model and disseminate exemplary practices. Availability of third-party assistance is critical to the realization of full, integrated services for all students and their families.

# *Summary*


The alliance between regular and special education has been stimulated and strengthened by the force of recent legislative action. This paper explored the evolution of collaboration efforts and future trends in the need for systemic changes in education.

One of the requirements mandated in the regulations for implementing P.L. 94-142 and Section 504 of P.L. 93-112 is that each handicapped student be educated to the maximum extent appropriate with students who are not handicapped—placement in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) (45 CFR 84.34; 45 CFR 121a.550).

The right of handicapped students to be educated in the least restrictive environment, which would include full-time or part-time participation in the regular classroom, requires communication and coordination between regular and special education components of the educational service delivery system. In the past, these two components functioned independently, with separate teacher training programs, students, staff, facilities, resources and curriculum. Currently, few states require regular education teachers to complete course work in educating handicapped children before becoming certified to teach.

Special education, however, is only one of several specialized programs currently serving specific populations of students (e.g., bilingual education, vocational education, Title I programs, etc.). Each has separate procedures, often creating barriers to the delivery of services.

Major role changes for school personnel are an inevitable result of P.L. 94-142 and Section 504 of P.L. 93-112. Regular teachers are expected to teach increasing numbers of exceptional students, and many special education teachers are now serving in a resource or consultant role. Such changing roles and responsibilities require adjustments in both preservice and inservice training for school personnel. Training is needed at both levels to help all educators clarify and define the scope of their roles, as well as to develop new skills necessary for a transition to a cooperative approach in the education of children with handicaps.

The Inspector General's Office of HEW identified a need for coordination of the separate programmatic administrative systems in order to eliminate barriers to delivery of services in a cost-effective manner. Collaborative efforts to coordinate responsibilities, resources, and procedures is of major importance in education today.

## Proposed Solutions

1) Personnel Development—Preservice training, inservice training, and consultation provide a means for special and regular administrators and teachers to acquire needed new skills.
2) Demonstrations and Model Sites—Actual examples of effective collaboration can provide the impetus for others to adopt/adapt similar practices.
3) Products—guidelines, directories, articles, and other practical products would be valuable resources.
4) A Network for Technical Assistance—Groups of skilled consultants can provide the individuals help needed by SEAs and LEAs in developing collaborative programs.
5) New Legislation—Some of the barriers to intra-agency collaboration require new laws.
6) Research—Well designed research studies should assist in identifying other viable solutions and in improving or evaluating current solutions.
7) Public Awareness Campaigns—Such programs would raise community awareness of the need for quality education for all students.

Proposed solutions could be partially achieved through the combined resources of existing agencies (e.g., professional organizations, universities, SEAs). However, since thorough and vital implementation of collaborative programs requires systemic changes, new resources also need to be developed (e.g., a coordinated network for technical assistance, patterned after the Regional Resource Center network).

# *Bibliography*


Audette, R. Primer of interagency agreements. In *Interagency collaboration on full services for handicapped children and youth: A guide to state level planning and development*. Developed by the Interagency Collaboration Task Force, Regional Resource Center, Learning Resources Branch, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Washington, D.C., 1979.

California State Department of Education, *California Master Plan for special education, evaluation report, 1977-78*. Sacramento, California: 1979.

Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, 84 *et seq*.

Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, 104 *et seq*.

Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, 121a *et seq*.

Dunn, L.M. Special education for the mildly retarded—Is much of it justified? *Exceptional Children*, 1968, 35 (1), 5-21.

Education of the Handicapped, August 1, 1979, 5 (16).

Gickling, E.E., & Theobald, J.T. Mainstreaming: Affect or effect. *Journal of Special Education*, 1975, 9 (3), 317-328.

Gickling, E.E., Murphy, L., & Mallory, D. Teachers' preferences for resource services. *Exceptional Children*, 1979, 45 (6), 442-449.

Harvey, J. Future trends in personnel preparation. *Exceptional Children*, 1976, 43, (3) 148-150.

Health, Education and Welfare, Region X, *Service delivery assessment: Education for the handicapped*. Seattle, Washington: 1979.

Hewett, F., Artuso, A., & Taylor, F. The Madison Plan really swings. *Today's Education*, 1979, 59 (8), 14-17.

Higgins, S., & Barresi, J. The changing focus of public policy. *Exceptional Children*, 1979, 45 (4), 270-277.

Hutson, H. As quoted in Inservice network outlines support and attitude problems. *Education of the Handicapped*, June 20, 1979, 5, (13), 4.

Johnson, G.O. Special education for the mentally handicapped—A paradox. *Exceptional Children*, 1962, 29 (2), 62-69.

Keogh, B.K., & Levitt, M.L. Special education in the mainstream: A confrontation of limitations. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 1976, 8 (1), 1-11.

Little, T. The Teacher—consultant model—a different perspective: A reaction symposium 13. *The Journal of Special Education*. 1978, 12 (3), 345-355.

MacMillan, D.L., & Semmel, M.I. Evaluation of mainstreaming programs. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 1977, 9 (4), 1-14.

Nevin, A. Special education administration competencies required of the general education administrator. *Exceptional Children*, 1979, 45 (5), 363-365.

Reynolds, M. New perspectives on the instructional cascade. In J. Vautour & C. Ricker (Eds.), *Child study team training program*. Austin, Texas: Special Education Associates, 1977.

Reynolds, M. & Birch, J. *Teaching exceptional children in all America's schools*. Reston, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1977.

Saettler, H. Current priorities in personnel preparation. *Exceptional Children*, 1976, 43 (3), 147-148.

Sarason, S.B., & Doris, J. *Educational handicap, public policy and social history*. New York: The Free Press, Macmillan, 1979.

Teacher Education Special Education, *Deans Grants' and University Affiliated Facilities Projects: A directory*. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico, 1978.

Yarger, S.J., Howey, K., & Joyce, B. Reflections on preservice preparation: Impressions from the national survey. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 1977, 28 (6), 34-37.